DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 209 173 SP 018 233

AUTHOR Gage, N. L.; And Others
TITLE Report of the Task Force on the Impact of the Research, Development and Field Activities of The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. Summary and Conclusions.
INSTITUTION Ontario Inst. for Studies in Education, Toronto.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 68p.; For related document, see SP 018 236.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Delivery Systems; Educational Assessment; *Educational Research; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Institutional Evaluation; Institutional Role; *Participant Satisfaction; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Research and Development Centers; *Research Utilization
IDENTIFIERS Canada; *Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

ABSTRACT

This report contains highlights of findings and major conclusions of a task force investigating the impact of research, development, and field activities of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE). The various data gathering activities and their results are summarized in Section A. Data collection efforts involved questionnaires sent to OISE project and conference participants, directors of education, school trustees, OISE faculty, and other educators in Ontario. Section B presents the general conclusions of the task force in the following areas: (1) OISE and the educational practitioners of Ontario; (2) the image of OISE in the province and in the press; (3) tension between basic and applied research ; (4) the balance between research projects, workshops, and field-related work; (5) OISE staff; (6) the field centers; (7) project evaluation processes; and (8) OISE publication efforts. The major conclusions, Section C, compare OISE and its staff favorably with other educational organizations on a world level and suggest a short term, massive attempt to enhance OISE impact. (FG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Report of the Task Force on the Impact of the Research, Development and Field Activities of The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

ED209173

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bernard J. Shapiro
N. L. Gage

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

N. L. Gage
Torsten Husén
James W. Singleton

SP 018 233

THE ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION
252 BLOOR STREET WEST, TORONTO, ONTARIO, CANADA M5S 1V6 TELEPHONE 923-6641
TELEX 06-217720

November 25, 1980

Dear Colleague:

It is with considerable pleasure that I forward the copy of the "Summary and Conclusions" report of the Task Force on Impact of the Research, Development, and Field Activities of OISE. This Report was commissioned by the Institute, and I would like to take this opportunity of thanking members of the Task Force, Nathan Gage, Torsten Husén, and James Singleton. I am sure that the excellent work they have done will have both an important and beneficial impact on the Institute.

There are nine major conclusions given in this "Summary and Conclusions" document. These represent, of course, the considered consensus of the members of the Task Force, not the adopted policy of the Institute or the present recommendations of its Administration. Nevertheless, it is my expectation that they will provide not only a perspective on our accomplishments to date but also a lively and proving challenge to the development of our plans for the future.

The Report will be systematically considered within the Institute. I would, however, also welcome comments from other interested readers.

Cordially,

Bernard J. Shapiro
Director

BJS:km

Contents

		Page
	Preamble	1
	Introduction	2
A.	SUMMARY FINDINGS	6
	Questionnaire for Participants in Projects and Studies	6
	Questionnaire for Conference/Workshop Participants	10
	The School Board Package: Questionnaires for (1) Directors of Education (2) Consultants, Coordinators & Supervisory Officials (3) Persons known to have had experience with OISE activities	12
	The School Board Package: Questionnaire for Trustees	15
	Faculty Questionnaires	17
	Press Coverage of OISE	18
	Indicators of Contribution to Scientific Thought	20
B.	GENERAL OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	21
	OISE and the Educational Practitioners of Ontario	21
	The Image of OISE in the Province	23
	The Image of OISE in the Press	29
	Tension Between Basic and Applied Research	29
	The Balance Between Research Projects, Workshops and Field-Related Work	32
	OISE Staff	33
	The Field Centres	40
	Project Evaluation Processes	45
	OISE Press	49
C.	MAJOR CONCLUSIONS	52
	Appendix: Curricula Vitae of Members of the Task Force	57

Preamble

The Board of Governors of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, in approving the "Director's Statement of Priorities and Financial Recommendations for Year 15: 1979-80", made formal its decision to examine the "impact" of its research and development as well as its field development activities. Although even fifteen years is a brief period in which to initiate and complete research and to see some lasting impact, the Board felt that some early glimmerings might be seen -- sufficient to help chart future directions.

Therefore, the Institute established a Task Force on the Impact of OISE Research and Development and Field Development. Its purpose has been to examine the nature and extent of the effect of the Institute's research, development and field development activity on the various "client" groups that have had contact with the Institute, with particular emphasis on the recent past. The findings of this study were expected to identify some of the most fruitful activities and provide the basis for recommendations for improvement and future directions.

The terms of reference given to the Task Force were quite specific and did not include many studies that members of the staff of the Institute and members of the public at large would have liked to see. No mandate was given to study the relationship between OISE and the University of Toronto; nor was any given to examine the intrinsic quality of large numbers of research projects, nor to order the priorities of the Institute for the future. All of these are topics worthy of study but not by a Task Force established to examine the "impact" of OISE research and development as well as field development activities.

Introduction

The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education carries out activities in three main areas: graduate studies, research and development, and field development. The nature, interplay and impact of the last two have been the subject of this study.

"Impact" has been taken to mean any observable and/or measurable effect, both direct and indirect, on individuals or groups. The ultimate target is, of course, the student in the classroom, but see our comment below concerning the feasibility of studying impact on students now. Individuals and groups that might be affected were considered to include schools, principals, teachers, federations, trustees, supervisory officials, and the Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, as well as the national and international community of scholars.

The Task Force has had exceedingly limited time and resources for a task of such extensive inquiry. These limitations have precluded most normal research approaches and have removed the possibility of some forms of in-depth study and analysis. Nonetheless, the Task Force proceeded on the assumption that sound judgmental conclusions could be derived from extensive, detailed communications with (a) individuals in the client groups (who were highly cooperative), and (b) all the other sources of information that could be assembled and analyzed within the time available. Thus, the sources are of four major kinds:

1. Papers and memoranda prepared by the various OISE departments and staff members as well as interviews with representatives of some of the academic departments;
2. Questionnaire surveys covering the various educational "client" groups of OISE in the province of Ontario;

3. Newspaper reports;
4. Indicators, such as citations in learned journals, of the quality of the research and scholarship produced by OISE staff in the areas of research and development and field development.

It is unfortunate but unavoidable that we have been unable to obtain first-hand the final evidence of OISE impact -- its effect on the student. To our knowledge, no study of the impact of educational research has so far been able to do this. There are obvious reasons for this shortcoming. The Task Force's limited time and resources precluded analyses of the breadth and depth needed to reach the student level -- had these been feasible. But perhaps of greater importance is that, in the fifteen years or so since the concept of OISE was presented to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, the Act had to be passed, the staff recruited, the building constructed and the research started. Only in the last five to ten years has any significant amount of research findings come from OISE into the hands of a reasonably large group of teachers for use in the classrooms of Ontario. At this time a study of OISE's impact on students in the school would be too premature to be useful. Educational change, for many reasons, is a very slow and highly incremental process. Even with a wealth of resources and time, an attempt to assess the Institute's impact in the classroom could easily have been futile, given the difficulties of disentangling the subtle influences of research-based practices from many other factors.

Instead, we have concentrated on the impact of research and field development upon the intermediate "clients" -- teachers,

trustees, administrators, planners and policy-makers -- in whom the impact is more readily discernible. One must assume that ultimately sufficient impact at this level will be reflected in the classroom and will subsequently have noticeable effects upon children, adolescents and adults under instruction.

Many of the conclusions in this report are of necessity judgmental. The members of the Task Force state this fact in explanation, not in apology. We individually tender our own credentials in defence of this facet of the conclusions.

The members of the Task Force* have been:

Dr. N.L. Gage of Stanford University, U.S.A.

Dr. Torsten Husén of the University of Stockholm, Sweden

Mr. James W. Singleton, retired educator, Ontario.

The executive officers of the Task Force, Dr. Stacy Churchill and Dr. Doris Ryan, and the administrative officer, Miss Jane Hill, assisted greatly in providing the Task Force with resources and contacts.

As is explained in the full report, the statistical base for many of our findings has consisted of persons nominated by OISE staff or selected by Directors of Education, rather than random representative samples of individuals from what could be considered the OISE constituency. For this reason, we have used the figures as a guide to our reasoning, and conclusions have not necessarily been drawn directly from the statistical data.

It could be argued that the sample of respondents is small and this point is readily conceded. Two thousand names is not a figure which necessarily inspires confidence that the opinion of

---

* Biographical data provided in the Appendix.

Ontario is being definitively described.

Further, the sample was derived from three sources: (a) nominations by OISE staff members of persons whom they knew to have participated in some way in some OISE activity; (b) respondents obtained as a result of distribution of questionnaires by Directors of Education within their educational systems; and (c) committees named by some provincial organizations to determine the position of each organization in relation to this study.

The conclusions and observations which follow are supported by evidence presented in Parts II and III of the full report and in the Appendices.

It will be obvious, we hope, that several of our conclusions and observations will indicate or imply suggestions about the future direction of OISE research, development and field development.

The present document is intended to serve both as a summation of the full report of the Task Force and as an independent short report, in that it presents the findings we considered highly significant as well as our conclusions and recommendations. The findings are organized into concentrated lists entitled "Highlights of Findings", followed by more detailed summaries.

The evidence on which we based our conclusions and recommendations is presented in the full report. The Institute may wish to publish more detailed interpretations of these data at some later date.

We offer one word of caution, particularly to those who may read only this short report. The term research should not be taken too literally or interpreted too narrowly. We found that, within

the Institute, staff use this word as verbal shorthand for all formal project work, even though formal projects include some entirely devoted to development or to field development and others that combine research, development and/or field development in varying proportions. Similarly, many of the statements from respondents to the various questionnaires indicate that OISE's clients not infrequently use the term research to describe any work by OISE personnel that is not exclusively directed toward professional development (i.e., virtually everything except workshop presentations or in-service training). As a rule of thumb, it may be useful to assume that research = research-and-(field)-development unless the word is modified by basic, fundamental, pure or some similar term.

The present document has three main sections: Section A summarizes major findings of the various data-gathering activities; Section B consists of the Task Force's observations and conclusions, whether impressionistic or derived directly from the data collected; Section C presents the major conclusions.

A. Summary Findings

The summaries that follow are highly condensed and contain almost no interpretation. The data sources used here, and other bases, are discussed in full in Parts II and III of the full report.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARTICIPANTS IN PROJECTS AND STUDIES

The Study

-- 1,046 questionnaires were sent to persons named by OISE staff as participants in formal projects or studies; 665 questionnaires (63%) were returned.

-- Questionnaires were analyzed for distribution of respondents by region, position of respondent, and organizational affiliation of respondent. Analysis of other data in terms of these dimensions was conducted where appropriate.

Highlights of Findings

-- Project participants were overwhelmingly favorable in their assessment of the general value of the projects in which they had been involved. Of those who responded to this item, more than 90% perceived the experience as valuable or very valuable in terms of all the designated categories. (It had been assumed that each respondent would indicate perceived value in one or two categories only.)

   Most highly valued were aspects of the activity related to the generation of ideas and the definition of problems.

-- Assessments in terms of specific, designated values were also extremely favorable. Items concerned with researching and solving educational and/or practical problems received the highest percentages of "Very Valuable" responses.

-- A majority of respondents felt that professionals involved in the activity (including themselves) had been significantly and positively affected by the experience, that this effect was moderate to high in degree, and that the experience so gained could be profitably applied to "some" or "considerable" degree in other situations.

-- Almost all participants felt that the activity itself would be valuable if repeated in other schools.

-- Approximately 80% of respondents knew of at least one program implemented in their school or system which had been developed or influenced by OISE. 28% could list three or more such programs.

-- A majority of respondents indicated that OISE's present level of involvement in Research and Development and Field Development should be increased.

-- The area in which increased OISE activity is most desired is research on practical problems affecting schools.

Specific Findings

-- OISE is no faceless entity to the participants in formal projects and studies; approximately 50% could name more than five members of OISE faculty or staff and 20% knew or knew about (through publications) more than ten OISE personnel.

Overall Value of Activity

-- When asked to assess the overall value of projects in which they had personally been involved, 84% of the respondents provided evaluative responses; the majority considered the project to be either "Valuable" or "Very Valuable". Only some 5% rated it "Not Valuable".

The highest percentages of "Very Valuable" responses were made to those questions that dealt with the value of the activity in terms of generating and defining ideas and problems.

Activities were judged least valuable with respect to "new or changed approaches to bringing about change in education" and "new or changed teaching methods".

Specific Value of Activity

-- Asked to rate the value of an activity when the value was stated in relatively specific terms, respondents again provided highly favorable responses. 90% of those who gave evaluative responses considered the activity "Valuable" or "Very Valuable" (across all categories). However, twice as many responses (32%) were non-evaluative when compared to responses referring to "general" values of project activities.

The highest percentages of "Very Valuable" responses were made to items concerned with researching and solving educational and/or practical problems (50% and 46% respectively).

The smallest percentages of "Very Valuable" responses and the highest percentages of "Not Valuable" responses were elicited by items concerning analysis of policy issues and teacher evaluation.

Effect on Professionals

-- The effect on professionals was considered to be moderate by 55%, high by another 35% of those who responded.

More than 80% of the respondents believed that the affected professionals will make "some" or "considerable" use of the experience gained in project activity in some other situation. 95% felt that the activity would be valuable if repeated in other schools.

Effects on Learners

-- Respondents had difficulty, as expected, in estimating numbers of learners affected directly or indirectly by project activity; significant numbers of respondents were unable to provide such estimates. Similarly, high "no response" rates were found with respect to estimates of effect on learners directly and indirectly affected. Over one-third of the estimates of direct effect range between part of one grade up to several grades from one or more schools.

Direct and indirect effects were judged to be moderate in degree by almost half of those who answered these two questions.

Level of OISE Activity

-- Nearly 93% of the respondents answered the question related to OISE's level of involvement in Research and Development and Field Development; of these, 58% indicated preference for increased activity while 41% stated that they would prefer maintenance of the present level of activity. Only 2% recommended a decreased level of involvement.

-- Respondents were asked to identify, from a list, those activities on which "you would like to see <u>increased</u> emphasis by OISE". The alternatives are shown below, ranked according to the percentage that expressed preference for each.

	N	%
Research in practical problems affecting schools	429	66
Work in professional in-service education	408	62
Direct help to schools and teachers with specific problems	400	60
Production of current materials and methods	385	58
Basic research in learning and instruction	382	58
Help with program implementation	329	50
Help with student evaluation	315	48
Analysis of educational policy issues	298	45
Work in adult or continuing education	207	31
Help with personnel evaluation	192	29

N = number of respondents checking each activity
% = percentage of respondents checking each activity

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CONFERENCE/WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

The Study

-- 671 conference/workshop questionnaires were sent to persons named by OISE staff as participants. 259 (37%) were returned, i.e., about half as many as among project participants, who usually had had more involvement with OISE staff (see Specific Findings).

-- Questionnaires were analyzed for distribution of respondents by region and position of respondent.

Highlights of Findings

-- Participants view the conference and workshop activities of OISE as a highly worthwhile experience. Only 6% of the respondents considered the experience of no value.

The most highly valued aspects of an activity related to the generation and definition of ideas and problems. These are the same aspects to which project participants assigned the highest percentage of "Very Valuable" ratings.

-- A large majority also rated specific values of the activity favorably.

-- 81% of the respondents indicated that the conference/workshop had led to some follow-up activity on their part.

-- Well over half the respondents could name one program in their own school or system which had been developed or influenced by OISE. More than 20% could list three or more such programs.

-- Almost 90% of the respondents would like to see OISE's level of research and development and field development activity maintained or increased.

-- Work in professional in-service education is the area in which increased OISE activity is most desired.

Specific Findings

Conference participants were less familiar with OISE personnel than were project participants, but many respondents knew a considerable number of persons at OISE and it seems unlikely that this group of respondents as a whole considers OISE an impersonal institution.

Overall Value of Activity

-- When asked to assess the workshops/conferences in which they had participated in terms of the general value of the activity, 78% made evaluative responses. 38% rated the general merits of the activity as "Very Valuable", 56% as "Valuable", and only 6% as "Not Valuable".

As with project participant questionnaires, an examination of individual questions revealed that the highest percentages of "Very Valuable" responses were accorded items dealing with the generation of ideas and definition of problems.

Specific Value of Activity

-- Assessments of workshops/conferences in terms of their specific value were also highly favorable; overall 31% of the respondents considered the experience "Very Valuable" and 58% "Valuable".

The highest percentages of "Very Valuable" ratings were accorded "improvement of professional skills" (40%) and "helping solve a specific educational problem" (40%).

The smallest percentages of "Very Valuable" responses were accorded "new or changed approaches to evaluations of learners" (25%) and "new or changed approaches to evaluation of programs" (20%).

Follow-Up

-- 81% of the respondents indicated that the workshop/conference experience had led to some follow-up activity on their part; 14% said no particular activity had resulted and 6% made no response.

The highest follow-up rate was reported by consultants, superintendents and directors (88%) while only 22% of college and university staff reported follow-up activity.

Level of OISE Activity

91% of the conference participants responded to the question related to OISE's level of involvement in research and development and field development; of these, 50% indicated a preference for increased involvement, 47% for maintenance of

present levels, and 3% for decreased activity.

-- Respondents were asked to identify, from a list, those activities "on which you would like to see increased emphasis by OISE". The alternatives are shown below, ranked according to the percent of respondents who checked each item.

	N	%
Work in professional in-service education	165	64
Research in practical problems affecting schools	147	57
Direct help to schools and teachers	131	51
Basic research in learning and instruction	110	43
Analysis of policy issues	103	40
Production of materials and methods	103	40
Help with program implementation	97	38
Help with student evaluation	90	35
Help with personnel evaluation	69	27
Work in adult or continuing education	64	25

N = number of respondents checking the activities
% = percent of respondents checking the activities

THE "SCHOOL BOARD PACKAGE": QUESTIONNAIRES FOR (1) DIRECTORS OF EDUCATION, (2) CONSULTANTS, CO-ORDINATORS AND SUPERVISORY OFFICIALS, AND (3) PERSONS KNOWN TO THE DIRECTOR TO HAVE HAD EXPERIENCE WITH OISE ACTIVITIES

The Study

-- Each director was asked to distribute questionnaires to (a) consultants, co-ordinators and supervisory officials, (b) persons within his jurisdiction known to him to have had direct contact with OISE activities, and (c) experienced trustees, and to complete one himself. Thus the Task Force had no record of the number of questionnaires actually distributed.

All questionnaires were identical except those for trustees, whose questionnaires are discussed in the next section.

French translations were sent to all francophone boards; duplicate sets in English and French were sent to boards known to have both English-and-French-language (or bilingual) schools.

-- Eighty-one boards (43.5%) returned at least one questionnaire.

-- The majority of respondents held responsibilities beyond the jurisdiction of a single school. Consultants, co-ordinators and supervisory officials comprised the largest group (44%).

-- Questionnaires were analyzed for distribution of respondents by region, position of respondent, and organizational affiliation of respondent. A breakdown of data in terms of these dimensions has been provided where appropriate.

Highlights of Findings

-- Approximately three-quarters of all respondents indicated familiarity with a broad range of types of OISE activities. This response was considered remarkable in that the present sample was one that was not chosen on the basis of involvement in an OISE project, workshop or conference, in comparison with the groups that received the questionnaire for project and conference participants.

A majority of the respondents indicated that the designated types of activities had had moderate to high impact on education in Ontario.

-- OISE is most favorably viewed by this group with respect to its involvement in basic research in education.

-- OISE participation in workshops was less familiar but was also positively evaluated; the influence of such workshops in changing local practice or policy, curricula and instructional approaches was the workshop focus most highly rated.

-- Regardless of whether OISE assistance with evaluation had been used by their own jurisdiction, an overwhelming majority of respondents perceived such assistance to be very useful.

-- Half the respondents reported having used OISE consultants on board-related matters; another 42% did not know whether such service had been received. 86% of the respondents considered such consultation to be very useful.

-- 84% of this group preferred that the present level of OISE activity in research and field activities be either increased or maintained.

-- The area in which increased OISE activity is most desired is work in professional in-service education.

Specific Findings

This questionnaire differed radically from that sent participants in OISE projects and conferences/workshops. The first sections present a 52-item list of Institute projects, materials, programs, publications and services. Respondents were asked first to assess these in general terms of "value to education in Ontario" and then to estimate actual usage of each item in the local jurisdiction. Responses to these items, although of great interest and relevance, do not lend themselves to brief summary.

General Impact of Designated Types of OISE Activities:

-- The high proportion of respondents to each item (66% to 88%) indicates that Institute activities in these broadly defined areas are well-known to directors and other educational administrators and consultants.

-- OISE is most favorably viewed by this group for its involvement in basic research in education; 81% of those who responded indicated that it had "Moderate" to "High" impact.

The four next-ranked items -- teaching materials, evaluation, curriculum and program development -- are quite closely related in that all provide materials or procedures for implementation at the classroom/school level.

Influence of OISE Participation in Workshops:

-- With regard to their influence in changing organizational, administrative and instructional practice or policy in their particular system or school, respondents gave the highest percentages of "Moderate" to "Very High" ratings to: curricular and instructional approaches (73%), evaluation plans or practices (69%), analysis of current educational issues (67%) and supervisory practices (66%).

However, non-evaluative replies, ranging from 33% to 49% for the various categories, were quite high for this item -- a result which may indicate lack of experience with OISE workshop activity.

Special OISE Services:

-- 38% of all respondents had received assistance from OISE staff in evaluation of "an organizational or program aspect in practice"; 49% did not know if such OISE assistance had been utilized in their jurisdiction, or did not respond. Of those who had used OISE staff in this way, 80% characterized the OISE assistance as very useful.

-- 50% of all respondents reported consultation by their jurisdiction with OISE staff concerning some board-related matter; 42% did not know if such consultation had taken place or did not reply. 86% of those who reported OISE consultation perceived the service as very useful.

Level of OISE activity

-- 34% of all respondents would like to see increased involvement by the Institute in research and development and field development activity; 44% would prefer that the present level be maintained; only 5% indicated that decreased activity levels would be desirable.

-- Respondents were asked to identify, from a list, those activities "on which you would like to see increased emphasis by OISE". The alternatives are shown below, ranked according to the percent of respondents who checked each item.

Area	N	%
Work in professional in-service education	373	61
Research in practical problems affecting schools	357	59
Basic research in learning and instruction	355	58
Production of curriculum materials and methods	335	55
Direct help to school systems and teachers with specific problems	324	53
Help with student evaluation	305	50
Help with program implementation	301	49
Analysis of important and provincial educational policy issues	282	46
Help with personnel evaluation	258	42
Work in adult or continuing education	233	38

N = number of respondents checking each activity
% - percent of respondents checking each activity

THE SCHOOL BOARD PACKAGE: TRUSTEE QUESTIONNAIRE

The Study

-- Each director was asked to distribute questionnaires to trustees in his jurisdiction who had several years' experience; thus, the number of questionnaires distributed is not known.

-- Completed questionnaires were received from 88 trustees, 50% of whom had served more than six years, and 25% more than ten years.

-- Respondents represented all six regions of Ontario, though 49% were from the Central Ontario Region.

Highlights of Findings

-- Basic research in education has, in the opinion of trustees, by far the greatest impact on education in Ontario of any OISE activity. Half those holding this view felt the degree of impact to be high.

-- OISE workshops were judged to be most influential with respect to "curricula and instructional approaches" and "analysis of current educational issues". More than half who had attended presentations on these two topics rated their influence on local practice or policy as high.

-- OISE assistance with local evaluation was characterized as "Very Useful" by more than three-quarters of those whose boards had received such assistance.

-- More than 40% reported that their board had utilized OISE consultants on some board-related matter; another 40% did not know whether OISE consultation had been sought.

Specific Findings

-- Trustees were, as expected, far less familiar with OISE faculty and staff than were project and workshop participants, probably because of the trustees' lesser involvement in graduate studies programs and their generally limited exposure to school materials and school-based programs. Nonetheless, half the respondents knew or knew of two OISE personnel; 10% could name five or more.

-- The question assessing perceived degree of influence of different types of OISE workshops upon local board practices or policy elicited response to the various items from only 47% to 58% of the trustees. This low response rate reflects either the fact that only half the respondents attended such workshops and/or an inability on the part of the trustees to assess influence of this kind of activity on local practice and policy.

Those who did respond perceived greatest influence in the "curricula and instructional approaches" and "analysis of current educational issues" with 54% and 53% respectively reporting "High" to "Very High" influence.

-- 43% indicated that their board had used OISE staff to evaluate "some organizational or program aspect in practice"; 19% responded negatively; 34% did not know and 3% did not respond. 77% of those who responded perceived such evaluation assistance as "Very Useful".

-- 44% reported local use of OISE staff as consultants on board-related matters; another 43% did not know whether such consultation had occurred.

-- Trustees were asked to assess the overall impact of OISE on education in Ontario in designated areas. Basic research in education was by far the one most frequently rated "High".

-- "Curriculum development", "program development", "field centre activities" and "evaluation" were also very influential, in the opinion of trustees. OISE was considered to be least influential in "curriculum implementation" and "policy analysis".

-- The low response rates and relatively high proportion of "don't know" responses suggest a special need to direct communication and information services to trustees.

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRES

The Study

-- 56% of OISE faculty returned questionnaires.

-- Overall figures for publications and other outputs were derived from these questionnaires and from project history files; the resulting data are therefore incomplete but provide adequate indicators of level of activity and productivity of individual departments and centres.

Highlights of Findings

-- OISE faculty most frequently characterized their own work as having had impact in "evaluation" and "basic research in education". There is close correspondence with the perceptions of school board personnel, who included both areas in their three top-rated areas of OISE impact.

-- There was close correspondence between the activities most frequently identified by OISE faculty as "vehicle of impact" for their own work and those items most frequently rated "Very Valuable" by project and conference participants in terms of general value to education. Both groups identified those activities concerned with the generation and definition of new ideas.

Specific Findings

-- Among self-reported project outputs, unpublished research reports and conference papers are the most frequent product; articles in professional journals and chapters in books are the most frequently published outputs. Curriculum units and modules are most frequently produced as OISE informal publications; this format is six times as frequent as is formal publication.

-- Principal investigators most often perceived "evaluation" (13%) and "basic research in education" (12%) as the type of impact of individual projects and least frequently mentioned "curriculum implementation" (5%) and "field centre activities" (4%).

-- Principal investigators most frequently perceived the "vehicle for impact" of individual projects as "helping define or better define a problem" (11%), "development or presentation of new or different approaches to problems" (10%). More specific effects were lower throughout, mostly only 4% to 6%.

PRESS COVERAGE OF OISE

The Study

-- 1,182 press clippings for the period 1965-1979 inclusive were analyzed; this collection was obtained from the office of the Director. The Toronto Star and The Globe and Mail have been systematically clipped; a relatively small number of articles from other sources were included.

-- The material was analyzed by staff of the Director's office.

-- Clippings were divided into (a) news articles, (b) editorials, and (c) descriptive articles. These were then classified as "positive comment", "negative comment", and "reference to OISE as an authority". A fourth category included reference to the Institute in letters to the editor.

-- Reference to OISE as an authority or an authoritative source of information and opinion were inferred to be neutral-to-positive in tone.

Highlights of Findings

-- Although there is a prevailing impression that the Institute has consistently received "a bad press", analysis revealed that articles favorable to OISE or which refer to the Institute as an authority outnmumber negative articles by more than two to one.

-- Editorials and other articles concerned with the idea of an institute were the most consistently negative in tone; articles describing OISE activities provided the highest percentages of positive comments; news stories most consistently referred to the Institute as an authority or to Institute reports as authoritative sources.

Specific Findings

-- Despite a pervasive opinion that press coverage has been consistently negative, if "authority" citations are combined with "positive" comments, roughly 43% of all clippings reflected favorably upon the Institute in contrast with the 15% which indicated negative evaluations.

-- Even in 1975, the year of heaviest criticism in the press, the combined percentage of positive and OISE-as-authority articles precisely equaled that of negative articles.

-- Editorials were most consistently negative and referred less frequently to OISE as an authority than either news or descriptive articles.

-- Descriptive articles provided the highest percentages of explicit positive comments.

-- News articles, predictably, made the most frequent reference to OISE as an authoritative source.

INDICATORS OF CONTRIBUTION TO SCIENTIFIC THOUGHT

The Sources

-- Citation counts for individual members of faculty for 1978-79 compiled by OISE library staff from Social Sciences Citation Index, 1978-79.

-- Arlin, M. Quantity and Impact of Scholarly Journal Publication in Canadian Faculties of Education. Canadian Journal of Education, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1978.

-- Schubert, S.H. Contributions to AERA Annual Programs as an Indicator of Institutional Productivity. Educational Researcher, July/August 1979.

-- A tabulation of first professional appointments held by graduates of the Institute, prepared by the Office of Graduate Studies.

-- Informal calculations of the proportion of competitive research funding obtained by the Institute from the total funds made available by such grantors as the Ontario Ministry of Education, Canada Council and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, provided by the Office of Research and Development.

-- Identification of published reviews of books, articles and learning materials by Institute staff; incomplete analysis on the basis of type of material being reviewed, type of journal or publication in which review appeared, potential audience for both original publication and review, publisher of original material.

Highlights of Findings

-- Of the 144 faculty members listed in the 1978-79 edition of Social Sciences Citation Index, 23% had between 11 and 20 citations.

The Institute was first in Arlin's 1978 rank ordering of Canadian faculties of education based on composite index of journal publications and citations of associate professors. The Institute's "Composite Index of 2.2 compared very favorably with that of second-ranked University of British Columbia (1.45).

-- Schubert's 1979 study ranked OISE 16th among "the top fifty contributors to the AERA program by university or college, 1975-79".

-- In the same study, OISE was ranked fifth in an ordering of institutions on the basis of "growth of productivity based on comparisons of 1975 and 1976 AERA program contributions to those of 1978 and 1979".

B. General Observations and Conclusions

1. OISE and the Educational Practitioners of Ontario

Because the pertinent tables from our questionnaire surveys appear in the main body of the report and the appendices, which will be available for study, they are not duplicated here. Some significant observations are worthy of mention:

(a) The overall picture conveyed by the various sources, not least the questionnaires, is that OISE is viewed with firm confidence by Ontario educators of various categories. The open-ended questions allowed ample opportunity for cr tic-ism, and criticism was expressed. Practically no respond-ents advocated that OISE activities should be curtailed, however, and many thought that more resources should be put at its disposal.

(b) Of the evaluative comments made about OISE and its work (in response to an unstructured request for "any other comment you may wish to make") by 525 respondents, 51% were positive. Only 19% contained negative comments. The remainder were unclassifiable because no judgment was made. It is evident that the comments tended to be distinctly positive when one considers that the two most frequent negative statements were to the effect that:

(i) OISE is too theoretical and too distant from prac-tice in the schools (a common and worldwide complaint about research institutions in general and educational research institutions in particular), and

(ii) the respondent knew only a small section of the Institute (i.e., a department or field centre) and therefore was unable to pass any judgment on the Institute as a whole.

(c) The staff of OISE are quite widely known on a personal basis among the respondent schools and staff of the province. When asked to name persons at OISE whom they knew, the average respondent could name many. Some said they had "just stopped writing" after ten or so had been listed. Understandably, Field Centre personnel were named most frequently, with those of Curriculum and Educational Administration following close behind. After these three, a considerable gap exists.

If "image" and "visibility" in the Ontario scene are desirable (and Ontario furnishes the overwhelming part of OISE's financial support), then some method of bringing other departments into closer or more widespread contact with Ontario practitioners should be devised and practiced. We shall comment later on this concern.

The answers to this part of the questionnaires revealed also that practitioners have difficulty in distinguishing OISE personnel from all other "outsiders", such as Ministry of Education personnel. Obviously, some work of the Institute is not credited to OISE through failure to identify its personnel.

(d) The majority of teachers, administrators and trustees of the province feel that the impact of OISE is moderate or high. Very few feel that the impact is low or non-existent.

(e) The respondents were asked for their opinion as to which areas of education they felt OISE should concentrate on. The perceived needs of education in the province are rather well delineated and, as expected, "research in practical problems affecting schools" was high on the list. However, "basic research" had almost as high a priority. There is clearly more support in the province for basic research than many have been led to believe. Nor is this finding necessarily inconsistent with the criticism that OISE is too distant from the schools. It may show that many practicioners are not opposed to basic research -- they only wish to be more closely informed of its aims, results and implications.

2. The Image of OISE in the Province

Outside the province of Ontario we find little difficulty with the Institute's image. Most scholars have contact with OISE through books published by its staff, contributions to learned journals, papers presented at conferences and congresses, etc. Such contacts are devoid of the "political" overtones that may exist within the province.

Several points are worthy of mention:

(a) Most research institutions in the world, not least those in the social sciences, suffer from an image problem with their nearby "client groups" and receive complaints about a communication gap. The situation is not surprising. High quality institutions try to divide their attention -- part going to contributions to "conclusion-oriented" or discipline-oriented research which serves the international

community of scholars and part to "decision-oriented" research which attempts to meet the concerns of the local jurisdiction. Even the applied research is divided into "near-term" and long-range" problem solving. Thus, a local jurisdiction might see itself as the immediate recipient of only a small fraction of the work of the research institution, not realizing that all research into education is potentially of value to the whole universe of education, including the local area.

This problem of image is one that must be understood and struggled with. Those departments that have high visibility in local areas perform a vital function for the Institute -- far more important than the ordinary value of the work they perform; they build a base of confidence upon which the Institute stands.

(b) Some of the respondents offered the criticism that they wished more communication (and many stated, for instance, the desire for more newsletters) from the Institute. A number of newsletters presently exist, such as the Field Development Newsletter and the Educational Administration Newsletter. There are also more formal communications such as the journal Orbit (sent to all schools in Ontario five times a year). The five or six newsletters and Orbit do receive relatively wide distribution. The answer to the important problem of communication may lie not in more writing but in more personal contact. The Institute has many allies who wish to feel themselves to be part of the battle.

(c) Responses to the questionnaires do reveal that OISE has an identity problem. Increased visitation and contact in the field would undoubtedly be of value to the Institute, especially if its personnel made quite clear who they were and where they had come from.

(d) One criticism from the general public and the politicians has taken the form of the question, "What have you done for education in Ontario?" A legitimate concern underlies this question, to be sure, but so also do two misconceptions.

(i) In the early days of the Institute there arose a grossly exaggerated and unrealistic conception of the ability of educational research to effect change and improvement in the schools of the province. It is true that the extreme form of this expectation did not appear in the presentation of the Act by the Minister of Education or in any of the speeches of the members of the Provincial Legislature. Yet the expectation was rampant and frequently used in explaining and gaining support for the new organization. Not only would the expectation become reality, it was believed, it would become reality almost immediately.

Such a dream was doomed from the start. Education is too complex a social process to be affected so much so soon.

Added to this unrealistic expectation was the sudden awareness (mentioned at length during the second

reading of the Act) that the Institute would have to find many of its staff outside the province. All parties were in favour of this process and, in fact, several speakers insisted upon it. Later, the appointment of professors of outstanding ability from outside the province proved to be a ready scapegoat for the failure to live up to expectations of instantly-produced dramatic changes. Fortunately, the criticism based on early staffing patterns has subsided markedly, according to the press clippings, but the disappointment caused by the exaggerated expectations tends to linger on.

In the earliest days of the Institute many outstanding scholars and researchers did come from other countries. In fact, a major reason for the establishment of OISE was the fact that at that time Ontario had few such people. Although this situation has been "corrected", the earlier criticisms still are brought forward when anti-OISE ammunition is required. (For the year 1979-1980, 65% of the academic staff were Canadian citizens and 35% citizens of other countries).

(ii) A further difficulty with the image of OISE's performance on the Ontario scene stems from a misunderstanding of the nature of a genuine research institution. The Institute's primary allegiance is to the cause of education and to that of students. It has no power to legislate its findings; it has no authority to force or coerce practitioners to perform according to its patterns of beliefs. This is a desirable situation for many reasons,

not the least of which is that OISE cannot take one rigid, uniform position. OISE must rely upon the validity and persuasiveness of its research findings only and on the general belief that most of the practitioners in the province are motivated by the same ideals as are the researchers.

To the interested parties, the product of research is indeed voluminous. Over the last fifteen years at least 500 major studies and a further 1500 minor projects have been in process or completed at the Institute.

In addition, one department alone (and probably several other departments could show similar results) lists, in a description of its graduate student programs, theses by masters and doctoral students as follows:

Masters' Theses	- completed	183
	- in progress	11
Ed.D. Theses	- completed	16
	- in progress	16
Ph.D. Theses	- completed	143
	- in progress	59

The titles of these theses reveal a high degree of catholicity of concern. The major and smaller scale studies of the staff of the Institute together with the theses of students must represent an overwhelming body of knowledge of direct and indirect concern to practitioners in Ontario. It would be difficult to find an educational problem that has gone untouched

by some study at the Institute. Yet, the use and application of this body of knowledge is -- and should, of course, remain -- voluntary.

Perhaps a more pertinent question is, "Why has not more of this work been used?" On that question also -- the problem of what is called knowledge utilization -- members of the Institute staff have contributed searching analyses and research.

(e) One significant and positive factor in the image of OISE has been the rising number of graduates in all areas and all levels of the teaching profession. The positions some graduates have attained indicate the quality of the programs of the Institute and the excellence of their application. Of particular importance is the large number of graduates who bring to the profession, and to practice in the schools, an understanding and an appreciation of the value and processes of research.

The Institute should never lose sight of its role in influencing future educational leaders directly through graduate studies and indirectly through their acquisition of the research skills needed for such studies.

The image of the Institute should be a matter of grave concern to every member of staff. It could be (and often is) argued that image and reputation among the Ontario educational constituency are of minor concern provided the staff of the Institute "do good work". Perhaps this is occasionally true, and in the best of all worlds, universally true; but here and now, the battle for confidence must be won as an active engagement in which all take part.

3. The Image of OISE in the Press

Although OISE has had a favorable press, i.e., the positive comments and articles significantly outnumber the negative ones, the Institute has received more adverse publicity than other institutions of higher learning in the province. As the analysis of press clippings has shown, the adverse publicity occurs mainly in the editorial pages of a couple of leading newspapers and not in new stories (where OISE is, on the whole, favorably portrayed as an authority (or feature articles.

It seems to us that OISE, given the reputation and the high esteem it holds among Ontario educators, deserves to be treated as any other academic institution, i.e., to be judged according to its objective achievements. For reasons we do not want to go into here, OISE has had the misfortune of becoming a target in political controversy that has had repercussions on the image of the Institute as portrayed in editorial pages. Publicly supported institutions require broad-based public support or acceptance. Therefore, the Institute and its staff must become increasingly aware of the necessity of illustrating to the press (and, through it, to the public) that their work in the field of education is responsible, constructive and economically justified.

4. Tension Between Basic and Applied Research

The existing tension between basic research work, whose application and usefulness is not immediately apparent or available, and work aimed at the relatively immediate improvement of educational practices and materials, is unavoidable; it is found in high quality educational research institution all over the world. Although

the present balance between these two emphases cannot be judged in any exact way by the Task Force, we have, inevitably, formed impressions. Arguments could readily be offered for increasing faculty and resources for basic work that would further enhance the Institute's standing in the eyes of research workers and scholars in education around the world.

The Institute has several researchers and scholars whose work is thus widely respected. But it is questionable whether, for its size and mission, OISE is carrying its fair share of the burden of fundamental scholarship and research in education -- work of a kind that will improve understanding and practice in education not only in Ontario and not only in the next five years, but everywhere and in the next generation.

The history of the physical and biological sciences and of the technologies based on them, such as engineering and medicine, offers abundant evidence of the eventual practical usefulness of investigations conducted with no immediate concern for their "relevance". The Task Force considers it unnecessary to argue this point. Whether the same disinterested work in the behavioral sciences which serve education -- psychology, sociology and anthropology -- will ultimately yield the same benefits to mankind is perhaps arguable, but reasoned examination of the question has led serious students to an affirmative position.

For the present report, the implications of the thinking and experience that underlie ideas of this kind are clear: educational research workers ought to have the freedom and opportunity to engage in investigations whose relevance to

practice is not immediate and obvious. Our judgment is that, insofar as resources become available, additional faculty and other resources ought to be allocated to the conduct of fundamental research.

Nonetheless, the present large commitment of the Institute to research and development of more immediate, direct and tangible value for the improvement of education ought not to be diminished. The development of practices and materials for use in teaching, in the education of teachers, in the administration of schools and in the formulation of educational policy ought to continue on the high level now achieved.

Fundamental research can readily be guided into areas that have a general promise of clearly practical applications. Such promise can largely be foreseen.

> We would expect, for example, that work on fundamental processes of learning would have applications, if any, mainly in education and not, say, in civil engineering... relevance is therefore specifiable in general terms, even for the purest of basic research; and it is on this basis that the public can justify the support of basic research even when specific applications are not immediately foreseen. (Ralph Tyler, Ed.) Prospects for Research and Development in Education. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1976. (p. 9)

We have already observed that there appears to be considerable support for basic research among practitioners in the province. Less surprisingly, we also observe strong support among the staff of the Institute. Therefore, we can only conclude that the dramatic reduction in the Ministry of Education transfer grant over the past few years has been the major force in increasing the emphasis on practical, short-term projects directly related to the concerns of the local jurisdiction. If this is true, it is then obvious that political forces

are at work attempting to focus OISE's attention on more narrow and immediate goals. Such forces are powerful and should be recognized for what they are -- response to a perceived demand for attention to provincial and immediate educational concerns. One should, however, be aware of the long-range effect of such a policy on the ability of the Institute to contribute to fundamental research, which in its turn can contribute to its short-range impact.

To bring more flexibility by means of full restoration of the Ministry of Education transfer grant is obviously not realistic. There is no way back, only a way forward. We would suggest that more freedom might be obtained by:

(a) serving the needs of the local jurisdictions better, and <u>appearing</u> to be striving for this goal;

(b) making a concerted effort to strengthen others' perception of such service, and;

(c) attempting to make visible <u>in the province</u> the value of the work aimed primarily at education as a discipline and the international community of scholars.

5. <u>The Balance Between Research Projects, Workshops and Field-Related Work</u>

Striking a balance between research activities on the one hand and workshops/field work/conferences on the other is a delicate matter. Research, by definition, is an act of contemplation and is conducted to a large extent in a world remote from the vendors of its products, whereas the conduct of work-

shops and conferences is part and parcel of the selling activities, which are much more visible.

Research is continually building a vast capital fund of knowledge. Every researcher and research institution must contribute to this storehouse. Field-related activities tend to draw their sustenance from this capital fund of new ideas, principles and factual findings.

OISE has an obligation, and its clients obviously feel that it has an obligation, to carry forward research activities on fundamental issues and thus contribute to the world's fund of knowledge.

It is our observation that some departments have concentrated (with considerable success) on one of the field-related activities or on fundamental research to the exclusion of the other. To the public, the activities of the Institute "balance out" because departments tend to compensate for each other.

6. OISE Staff

We assume it to be clear that any organization which in fifteen short years has achieved international recognition for its scholarship and research must be staffed by a sufficient number of highly competent people. We have seen direct evidence of this competence on all sides during this study. In addition, we realize that staff members whose productivity and competence are not primarily in research may well have redeeming values in graduate studies, field-related work, and other work. It is against this background and this qualification that our observations on staff should be read.

Because of its solid base of staff competence, OISE may be ready for a quantum leap forward on the national and international scenes. Several models for such a move have been used in other institutions with varying degrees of success. The route we would propose is an adaptation of the "star" system to the Canadian context. "Stars" are those people whose stature and brilliance are readily recognized among leading scholars in their respective fields. Such persons are major contributors to conferences of the learned societies and to journals of serious thought. They are the authors of highly significant works. Their publications are sought and read for the seminal ideas often found in them. OISE already has several such "stars".

Historically, it could be shown that the deliberate attraction of outstanding scholars, sometimes through the establishment of a series of "chairs" or special appointments, liberally endowed, is one powerful device by which staff upgrading can be achieved. The University of Chicago in the 1890s and Stanford University in the late 1950s and 1960s are models of achievement by this method and of the fruitfulness of the process once it is firmly established. Not only would the outstanding thinkers raise the stature of the Institute by their identification with it, but they would attract more able colleagues and students who wish to work and study with them. The influence of the "stars" would extend well beyond the borders of Ontario and endure for generations.

The establishment of a series of chairs or special appointments such as we have mentioned would inevitably be accompanied by an aura of excitement and a feeling that exceptional things are happening.

It would be erroneous, we believe, to assume that one or two people could effect the results we envision. Even a handful of people could not generate quickly enough the type of thinking that would cause the radical change that should occur; twenty might accomplish it.

This concept gives rise to three crucial questions:

(a) Where does the funding come from?

(b) Where do the "stars" come from?

(c) How do we obtain the vacancies that the incoming people will fill?

All of these questions require some answer, lest we be accused of purely wishful thinking.

The funding is, of course, the crucial issue. Such people as we are discussing require generous salaries. Chairs such as those envisaged require endowment in order to offer stability to the incumbent. Financing on an ad hoc or an annual basis would be counter-productive, as would be failure to fund the incumbent's research adequately. It would be a pleasant thought that increased government funds, outside the Institute's normal operating expenditures, might be forthcoming for this purpose. However, even though some resources might come from the government, total funding is unlikely in the present climate.

Accordingly, we must turn to the private sector -- to the foundations and to the major business and industrial organizations -- and in an organized way present the claims. Endowed chairs provide one solution.

The issue of where the "stars" would come from is a sensitive and emotional one in Ontario. Obviously, as previously mentioned, half a dozen are already on staff and should fill some of these special

positions. Others will probably be found located in the great universities of such countries as England, France, the United States, Germany and Canada. But not exclusively even there. Gold is where you find it. Ontario must, in respect of these appointments at least, drop its sensitivity in this matter.

Creating the vacancies that the incoming people will fill is another problem. It is true that no vacancy need exist if a special endowed chair were created. However, as mentioned before, such "stars" frequently bring with them other colleagues and attract good graduate students who thrive on their proximity.

OISE was originally staffed at a time of great shortage of university teachers in general and of academic professional staff at the doctoral level in particular. Despite this fact, the Institute, on the whole, acquired a strong and highly competent staff.

All organizations need constant review and evaluation of staff. We are believers in periodic peer review. Those whose work is inadequate in one area, and who present no compensating extra contribution in another, should have to improve. Gresham's Law applies not only to money but to staff as well.

Two basic prerequisites must be met if OISE is going to fulfill its task as a research and development institute that properly serves Ontario.

(a) <u>It must recruit researchers who are intellectually strong and creative</u>. This is, we realize, not easy under present conditions; like other Canadian academic

institutions, OISE has to work under financial constraints. Given the uncertainty about the future, premium is put much more strongly on job security now than earlier.

(b) It must maintain basic research, without which applied and development studies run the risk of becoming shallow and repetitive.

The two prerequisites are closely interrelated. Good basic research cannot be conducted without access to a staff able to work on the frontier of research endeavours. These prerequisites are essential in building up good academic reputation, which in its turn attracts other able researchers.

Staff who will not or cannot contribute (and fortunately, they are few) in one of the major fields of endeavour do disservice to the Institute. They weaken its credibility, they increase the burden on others, and, worst of all, they block the entry of those would could serve better.

Periodic peer review of both tenured and untenured staff would be a clear recommendation of the Task Force.

The Institute has some staff members who, although they do research, publish and teach, see as their major task the establishment of contacts within the schools and boards of the province. This work is often unnoticed because it is casually done and is seldom a matter of record. These staff members assist local schools in formulating their problems, in finding solutions and in identifying the leverage points needed for implementation. We have already mentioned the Field Centres, Curriculum Department and Educational Administration Department as having high performance and recognizable identity in these areas, and other staff members have proven competence in them as well.

Success in these activities is vital to the health of the Institute, which will be in jeopardy if its credibility in the schools is not solidly based. Staff members who strengthen this "grass roots" credibility perform a function of great value to the Institute; some device or process to accord it recognition ought to be initiated.

A further observation might be made. The feeling, which many respondents voiced, that OISE was isolated from the daily practical concerns of the schools is a common one, and one directed toward most research and teaching institutions throughout the world. We are almost of a mind to accept the charge of "ivory tower" as a pro forma complaint, except that we can envision other responses which ought to be explored.

First, it is surprising to us that some departments which one would have expected to have high visibility and contact in local school systems do not seem to have

established such working relationships. It may well be that they are fighting battles in other arenas. However, we are convinced that much of the battle for impact lies in the schools and in the classrooms.

Second, if local contact on a wider scale is desirable, it cannot be effectively achieved on an individual ad hoc basis. The past fifteen years indicate that such a basis leads to heavy concentration of effort in the Toronto area, leaving the more distant areas entirely to the Field Centres, which provide excellent but often thinly-spread resources.

Departments ought to be encouraged to identify in local school systems the leverage points for their particular expertise. In the case of such departments as Sociology, Educational Planning, and Educational Administration, the people who are the entry points to local systems are easily identifiable, e.g., social workers, planning officers, principals, directors and attendance officers. An organized cultivation of such persons on a province-wide basis is essential and should be deliberately planned. In addition, certain school boards ought to be studied in depth because they have problems that are typical or common, on the one hand, or atypical and unusual, on the other. Identifying such boards and reasons for a study ought to be a departmental process.

Other departments ought to be encouraged to focus on whole school systems and establish personal contacts, in order to help define local problems and assist the teachers or administrators who face them. Such contacts should be consistent and

extend over a long period of time, building on a cumulative basis. Using the Field Centres as a means of approaching outlying regions would have the advantage of an already existing basis of credibility. The rules for such entry into school systems could be spelled out so as to ensure coordination and courtesy.

The proposals of the Task Force in the area of academic staffing are made in full knowledge of the high degree of competence for which the Institute is now justly recognized. The proposals are also advanced in the realization that staffing patterns cannot remain inflexible. Although a "star" system may not be realizable in the immediate future, steps should be taken now to keep the several outstanding scholars already on faculty. Undoubtedly they are attractive to other institutions with resources and foresight.

7. The Field Centres

The operation of the Field Centres -- a major component of OISE's system for delivering services to the schools, teachers and administrators -- has been of great interest to the Task Force. This interest has been heightened by the very favorable response from the practitioners, to some of whom the Field Centres are the Institute. We have no doubt, after examining the questionnaire responses and comments, that these people feel that the Field Centres are dealing with the problems in their schools almost immediately. A positive evaluation emerges in the large majority of cases.

We are aware of a few attempts in other jurisdictions to establish delivery systems and none has been successful in the

way in which the OISE Field Centres have been successful.

The model by which research is interpreted and made local in content -- and by which materials are provided and "sold" to local systems by persons with special communication skills -- has been tried in the United States and has often proved ineffective. Such communicators appear not to feel at home with the research workers, on one hand, or with the "users", on the other. But even more fundamentally, this process is bound to fail because it frequently represents research solutions going in search of problems.

The high degree of acceptance of the OISE Field Centres by the schools of Ontario appears to us to be based upon a combination of three factors:

1. The staff of the Field Centres is composed of professional academics fully on a level with those who work within the Institute's walls. Each has his or her own interests and the academic freedom to pursue them. Field Centre staff can apply for research monies to carry forward individual projects. Each represents more competence than the communicator/technician mentioned above.
2. One of the present strengths of the Field Centres is that, in being too decentralized for bureaucratic control, they acquire a great flexibility in their method of operation with the schools. Such diversity as now exists is undoubtedly a virtue in itself. It certainly allows the Centres to adapt their approaches from situation to situation.

3. The Field Centres have several methods of dealing with the schools. Some Centres encourage them to seek assistance with the problems which they, the schools, perceive. The staff of the Centre then assists them to define the problems. Later, as confidence develops, the interplay may originate with either party. In fact, in some instances it is quite difficult to see how an idea germinated and developed, a condition which is the essence of good interchange. Other Centres encourage staff to drop ideas almost as agents provocateurs, thus helping schools recognize problems that they did not realize they had. In this manner the underpinning of large and widespread projects can evolve. Still other Centres, at times, tackle a specific situation through wide-scale implementation in several schools to elicit mutual support relationships between schools and systems.

The advantages of the present structure are numerous. The flexibility allows Centres to adapt their methods to local needs. In fact, some Centres could operate in each of the ways depending on the subjects and "user" groups. The quality of professional staff in the Centres allows such flexibility to be available and to be used intelligently.

In Ontario, schools and local jurisdictions are scattered over a wide area. They vary so much in size and cultural background that we feel it necessary for the Field Centres to adapt

themselves locally. Almost total flexibility in method, organization and operating style is necessary for successful co-operation between the Centres and the schools. The basic danger of such a "free flowing" system is the failure to recognize the difference between looseness and inefficiency. In other words, the demands on leadership are far greater in a flexible system than in a rigid one.

There are six Ministry of Education Regional Offices and eight OISE Field Centres. Until recently there were nine Ministry Regions. OISE's Field Development "regions" were set up to correspond to these and in most instances the OISE Field Centres were established in the town or city where the Regional Office was located. One was not, for a number of locally determined reasons; the second exception was OISE's Central Ontario Centre, serving the Metro Toronto area, which fell into two Ministry Regions.

In those locations where there are both Regional Offices and Field Centres, the suggestion is regularly made that both functions be combined into one office and one staff. Such a combination would be disastrous, probably for both functions but certainly for the Field Centre role. The Field Centres provide a staff function and service to local schools and teachers. As such, their image is non-threatening and conducive to confidence sharing. Ministry Offices are "in-line" functions. Local staff look upon their staff as authority or semi-authority figures and are, for that reason, less likely to seek certain kinds of assistance or even reveal the presence of weaknesses or difficulties.

There is so much in one function's operation which is subtly inimical to that of the other that we cannot recommend that the functions be joined. In fact, lest they appear to be joined, we doubt the value of having them in the same building. The Centres and Offices play separate roles and are staffed to fulfill them.

We know of no other field centre operation as successful in serving the needs of the schools and in being recognized to be doing so, as the present one at OISE. Yet we must recognize the validity of the statement in the report of the Co-ordinator of Field Development that, "Given OISE's comparatively small resources, and the large demand, those boards that demonstrate little interest tend to receive little service". But perhaps this is as it should be. If OISE were to intrude into local systems, and certainly if the intrusion aroused greater demand for service than could be met with the resources available, other types of problems would arise. Demand for service will rise as the role of the Field Centres is appreciated more widely, but resources probably will continue to be restricted. Self-help within schools may become a more attainable goal for Field Centres, however, because of the expanding number of OISE graduates in schools and their staffs' increasing expertise in the use of research tools. The mobilization of the alumni of the Institute's graduate studies programs may be an initial step in this process.

8. Project Evaluation Processes

One concern of the Task Force has been a certain untidiness and inconsistency in the integration of evaluation processes into the various activities of the Institute. This observation does not necessarily imply a lowering of standards or a failure of internal discipline. On the contrary, in the realm of sponsored research, the evidence is clear that, whenever OISE staff compete with the staff of other institutions for research funds, Institute staff are extremely successful. Some of this success should be attributed to a very active Research and Development Office; but there does come a time when the quality of a proposal stands alone and its success must then be credited to its authors.

Up to 1971-72, sponsored research accounted for a small proportion of OISE revenue -- only about 3%. In 1971-72, it exceeded $1,000,000 for the first time and was just under 12% of Institute revenue. From 1971-72 through 1977-78, sponsored research ranged from 9 to 13% of Institute revenue, hovering around the $2,000,000 figure. In 1978-79, sponsored research amounted to approximately 2.8 million, or about 17% of Institute revenue.

Thus, revenues from sponsored research, which are "earned" in competition with other institutions, have grown greatly both in dollar amounts and in percentages of the budget. Such rapid growth is indirectly an evaluation of confidence in the Institute.

Therefore, our concern is not that, in the absence of

formal structured evaluation processes, quality has declined. It is rather that any future early signs of decline might pass undetected. As an illustration, we would note the following:

(a) Staff Evaluation

We have already recommended (see p. 37) that the work of all academic staff, both tenured and untenured, should be reviewed periodically. Most responsible academics, provided they are given the time to prepare, welcome the opportunity to discuss their research and its outputs with their colleagues. Nor need this procedure be conducted in a structured, private setting. In most medical schools and research institutions, staff frequently hold open talks and seminars on the nature and findings of their latest research. Such a model ought to be more commonly used in OISE than it is. Academic isolation must be overcome.

(b) Director's Statement of Priorities

We are highly appreciative of the use of the document called the "Director's Statement of Priorities and Financial Recommendations" as a guide in giving a direction to the Institute's concerns and, from our point of view, giving a guideline for perceiving the relevance of research projects to the aims and objectives of the Institute. We realize that a time lag exists between the two aspects of the document -- financial recommendations and priority establishment. If financial recommendations must be established annually, it does not necessarily follow that research and field priorities ought to be rigidly structured with them. Research priorities

(the formulation of which is one major use of the document) ought to be structured on a longer time frame than annual statements.

Statements of priorities, because they closely involve Institute staff in their formulation and have been approved by the Board of Governors and the Assembly, are most useful tools in providing control and impetus to research directions of the Institute. They gain further significance (and most of the literature makes this point) if followed by other documents, also emanating from staff and governing bodies, that attempt to analyze the congruence of achievements with priorities. It could be argued that the Annual Report of the Board of Governors serves this purpose, but it really does not serve as a companion piece to the priorities statement, nor does it provide a perspective for viewing achievements in relation to priorities. Such a statement of achievement ought to address itself to the specifics, as does the priorities document, of how the Institute is serving the needs of practitioners in Ontario as well as the cause of education as a whole.

(c) As a sidelight on the statement of achievements mentioned above, we note that nowhere in the Institute could we find an up-to-date statement of the research accomplished and in progress for each principal investigator, together with a list of outputs, although the Office of Research and Development can provide this information with respect to all funded projects.

(d) We have observed a fundamental weakness in the evaluation of individual large-scale projects, although some are evaluated in that the materials they generate are "tried" in the classroom. Nevertheless, it is not infrequent that a principal investigator, once his or her research findings are completed, loses interest in further application or lacks the expertise to pursue the matter into local practical implementation, or even simply lacks the time to do so.

It is recommended that each principal investigator of an internally funded project be required to include in the original proposal a statement of how the project will be evaluated and to indicate the approximate cost of such an exercise. He or she could indicate whether the outcome will be a book, article, learning materials for classroom use, training manual for workshops for principals, etc. and state that the evaluation should be done by an outside evaluator on the basis of classroom implementation, etc. Then, if the principal investigator is unwilling or unable to carry the project forward to its ultimate conclusion, a Field Centre or other group could make an offer to conduct the practical application.

These four recommendations -- staff evaluation, formulation of a statement of achievements that permits analysis in terms of priorities, a complete list of outputs for each staff member, and a statement outlining proposed evaluation procedures for each large-scale internally funded project -- are

specific examples of a desire on the part of the Task Force to see a "step-up" in evaluation processes. We do recognize that internal departmental evaluation procedures exist, but we feel that such procedures may not be sufficiently at "arm's length", i.e., as objective and disinterested as they should be.

We also recognize the value of evaluation within the Research and Development Office for externally funded projects and the fact that the sponsors have their own evaluating processes. Our concern is not entirely that the evaluating processes are never carried out (because, in many instances, they are), but that they are not a structured part of "standard procedure".

9. OISE Press

OISE Press has existed formally for an exceedingly short time, although most of its functions have been performed for many years by the earlier Publications Division. The establishment of OISE Press was a bold and necessary move. The advantages of a "house press" are so obvious as to need no elaboration.

Unfortunately, once the Press had been established, the approach seems to have become timid and over-cautious. At present the organization pays no advances on royalties to authors, distributes to each author only ten free copies (under normal circumstances) for distribution to colleagues in the field, and makes no systematic or concerted effort to break into the foreign market -- the United States market in particular. As a result, OISE press is, in the main, restricted to publishing titles that have runs ranging from 500 to 1500

copies, which show little or no profit and which typically, because of their limited distribution, have only slight impact on the worlds of practice and scholarship.

We note with concern (but understanding) the following quotation from one of the departmental reports:

> Much of Dr. _____'s work has been published and promoted by commercial enterprises and I am quite confident that the same will happen to ...

At present, OISE Press has approximately 160 active publications and is prepared to accept manuscripts from outside sources. In addition, the Press publishes Orbit five times a year and some of the other newsletters produced at the Institute. (Additional newsletters, annual reports and similar documents are produced by projects, academic departments, and field centres.)

There can be no doubt that OISE Press has the potential to provide a vital function -- the projection of OISE's impact through the research reports and other products of its staff intensively throughout the province and the international community of practitioners and scholars. This potential is not being realized. Certainly financial constraints exist; what is less certain is the extent to which financial constraints either reflect or cause a lack of aggressive policy for, and positive expectations regarding, the Press. It is not a situation that can be ignored in the hope that it will go away. Only analysis and resolution will break the present cycle in which the most "marketable" manuscripts go elsewhere because OISE Press cannot produce or promote a truly successful, widely popular book, while the Press cannot afford large runs or

effective advertising because it receives only manuscripts of limited potential interest.

The key issue to be resolved is the relative value to be placed on OISE Press by the Institute as a whole. The question has to be put, "Should the Press be a vital component in projecting the work and character of the Institute among a broad spectrum of client groups and interested parties, or should it mainly fulfill the role of publishing works that cannot by reason of numbers, etc., be handled by commercial publishing houses?" On the answer to that question will hinge the future of OISE Press.

The route to the future seems clear to us. The Press will need to be even more heavily subsidized in the short run, or it will become a perennial loser in the long run. There is no doubt that the Publications Board is examining the deficiencies of the situation, some of which have been noted above.

If the Institute concurs in our belief that the Press can be one of the bridges between the work of OISE staff and a world-wide audience and agrees that the construction of such bridges is an objective to be pursued, then the problems are those of money and attitude.

Obviously, limited resources are a major cause of the present low-key approach. More funding is required, certainly in the initial stages. Various suggestions come to mind, such as building into the proposal for every project likely to lead to publication a request for funding to subsidize it, a suggestion that has the weakness of transferring financing from research to publication. Similar problems arise with respect to almost

any proposal to transfer more internal funds to the Press.

Thus, funding will probably have to come from external sources. It is altogether conceivable to us that -- among the major oil companies, banks, other large commercial enterprises and large foundations -- at least one, or a consortium of several, could be found to endow the OISE Press and fund it over, say, a five-year period, until it begins to carry out its proper mission. It is our judgment that such resources are available and accessible to the right approaches. This is an avenue that other institutions of higher learning have explored successfully.

C. Major Conclusions

The members of the Task Force have examined all of the evidence at their disposal and have discussed the status of OISE with many colleagues. Our conclusions are based upon the best available collection of assessments made by representatives of the OISE constituency that was possible within the time and cost limits of the Task Force. They reflect an analysis of responses to questionnaires, lists of publications and materials produced by the Institute, reviews of books written by Institute staff and/or published by the Institute, and the degree to which the writings of OISE researchers are cited by other research workers and scholars. In addition, we have examined the reports of various department heads -- reports that summarize the research projects, publications and products of the department as a whole and of its individual members. We have also exercised our prerogative of individual and collective

judgment. We feel convinced of the validity of the following main conclusions.

(a) OISE is a world class organization comparable in size, scope of mission and quality of work to such institutions as:

In the United States: The Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development; Teachers College, Columbia University; and the College of Education of the University of Illinois;

In England: The National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales:

In the Federal Republic of Germany: The Max Planck Institute for Educational Research, Berlin.

The majority of colleagues consulted, albeit informally, place OISE within the top ten educational research institutions in North America. In view of the short period since its inception, OISE has a standing in the scholarly world that in itself is a considerable achievement.

(b) OISE's work and many of its scholars are known and respected by researchers and scholars throughout the world, particularly in the United States, Canada and England.

(c) The research and development achievements of OISE are of such volume and quality that there is clear evidence that OISE is the outstanding institution of its type in Canada.

(d) OISE's work is well known and respected by educational practitioners in Ontario who have had access to its services and findings. A great majority of these are favorable to OISE's work and products.

(e) A strategy for slow incremental enhancement of OISE's impact will require a clearer definition of its priorities, as well as a conscious decision to channel its resources into those activities which are productive and recognized (and an implicit decision to withdraw resources from other activities). We are not persuaded that OISE, as an institutional entity, possesses the desire or self-knowledge to make such decisions. Further, the highly complex decision-making mechanisms within the Institute appear to us to be subject to frequent change and unlikely to enforce long-term policies of this kind.

This route is possible, however, if there exists a certain kind of leadership -- leadership at both the central and departmental levels that forces the Institute as a whole to face up to the realities of its situation and focuses aspiration and resources consistently toward the goal of increased impact.

(f) What the Task Force suggests, in addition to the approach described above, is a short-term, massive attempt to enhance impact. We believe that OISE's institutional maturity will support such a strategy. We therefore recommend the recruitment of a number of "stars" to OISE

staff. There are problems inherent in this approach; these have been discussed earlier in our report. We do not believe that these problems are insuperable. We believe that an appropriate adaptation of the "star" system will increase impact (through increased visibility, among other things), attract highly desirable new faculty and students, and provide better focus and definition for the research and field programs of OISE.

(g) Periodic staff review would both ensure quality of performance and increase knowledge of the scope of Institute programs among faculty.

(h) Evaluation of project work should become routine. Where appropriate, evaluations should be carried out by external reviewers; formative evaluations and field trials of learning materials or methods might well be carried out by Field Centres.

(i) The Institute must nurture its sense of appropriate balance between fundamental and developmental work. Short-term pressures or inducements must not be allowed to tip program emphasis permanently in one direction.

In concluding this report we wish, as a Task Force, to acknowledge with gratitude the cooperation we have received on all sides and to express our pleasure at the opportunity to examine at first hand various facets of an institution of world-class stature. It is our opinion that, even in view of its limitations and constraints, OISE has outstanding value to Ontario and represents a

major national asset. That it has achieved this status and effectiveness in some fifteen years is a considerable tribute to all who have played a role in its formation and development -- not the least among these being the Legislature of the Province of Ontario, the successive Boards of Governors, the two Directors, the support staff in its multi-faceted functions and also, and most outstandingly, the professional and academic staff.

APPENDIX

CURRICULA VITAE OF MEMBERS OF THE TASK FORCE

NATHANIEL LEES GAGE

CURRICULUM VITAE

as of June 1979

University of Minnesota, A.B., magna cum laude, with major in Psychology, 1938
Purdue University, Ph.D., Psychology, 1947
Litt.D. (Honorary), 1978

Academic Positions

Purdue University

Assistant Director, with rank of Assistant Professor, Division of Educational Reference	1947-48

University of Illinois

Assistant Professor of Education	1948-51
Associate Professor of Education	1951-56
Professor of Education	1956-62
Professor of Psychology	1961-62
Member, Senate Committee on Student English	1949-52
Member, various years, College of Education's Policy Committee, Committee on Promotions in Rank and Pay, and Personnel Committee	
Research Coordinator, College of Education	1960-62

Stanford University

Professor of Education	1962-
Professor of Psychology	1963-
Member, Committee on Undergraduate Admissions	1964-67
Member, Academic Senate's Research Policy Committee	1966-67
Member, Committee on Research (Chairman, Subcommittee on the Relationship of Research to Teaching) of the Study of Education at Stanford	1967-68
Member, Committee on Foreign Study Programs	1972-74
Member, Task Force on Sponsored Research Volume	1975-76

Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching

Co-Director	1965-68
Chairman, Executive Board	1968-76
Acting Director	1970-71, 1975
Program Director, Program on Teaching Effectiveness (SCRDT to 1976), Center for Educational Research at Stanford	1972-

Other Academic Institutions

Member, Research Team, National Training Laboratory for Group Development, Bethel, Maine	1950
Member, Summer Seminar on Person Perception, Social Science Research Council, Harvard University	1955
Visiting Professor, New York University	1959
Consultant on Methodology, Conference on Research in Religious Education, Cornell University	1961
Fellow, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences	1965-66
Special Fellow, U.S. Public Health Service	1965-66
Diamond Jubilee Lecturer, School of Education, New York University	1966
Distinguished Alumni Lecturer in Psychology, Purdue University	1968
Instructor, Seminar on Learning and the Educational Process, Munich, Germany	1971
Professor, Stanford in Germany	1971
Fellow, John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation	1976-77
Julius and Rosa Sachs Visiting Professor of Psychology and Education, and Sachs Memorial Lecturer, Teachers College, Columbia University	1977
U.S. Information Service Lecturer, University of Hamburg and University of Heidelberg	1978
Visiting Professor of Education and Psychology, Teachers College, Columbia University	1979

Memberships

Phi Beta Kappa	1938 -
Sigma Xi	1940-
American Psychological Association	1942-
Fellow, Divisions of Educational Psychology	1954-
Personality and Social Psychology	1954-
Measurement and Evaluation	1954-
Fellow of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues	1954-75
American Educational Research Association	1946-
Phi Delta Kappa	1947-
American Association for the Advancement of Science	1948-

Editorial Positions

Consulting Editor, Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology	1956-64

Consulting Editor,	Sociometry	1956-64
Associate Editor		1958-60
Editor,	Handbook of Research on Teaching (A Project of the American Educational Research Association)	1957-62
Co-Editor	Readings in the Social Psychology of Education (A Project of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues)	1959-62
Consulting Editor,	American Educational Research Journal	1964-70
Consultant,	American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language	1965-69
Member, Board of Editors,	Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Fourth Edition	1965-69
Consulting Editor,	Journal of Educational Psychology	1963-75
Consulting Editor,	Contemporary Psychology	1967-73
Referee,	Journal for Research in Mathematics Education (A Publication of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics)	1969-
Member, Editorial Advisory Board,	Current Contents: Social and Behavioral Sciences	1969-
Consulting Editor,	Educational Studies: A Journal of Book Reviews in the Foundations of Education	1970-
Advisory Editor,	Instructional Science	1971-
Editor,	Psychology of Teaching Methods: The 75th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 1	1972-76
Consulting Editor,	Educational Research Quarterly	1976-
Member, Editorial Advisory Board,	Texas Tech Journal of Education	1976-

Positions in Organizations

President,	Division of Educational Psychology, American Psychological Association	1961-62
President,	American Educational Research Association	1963-64
Chairman,	Committee on Relations between Psychology and Education, American Psychological Association	1960-62
Member,	Advisory Committee, Curriculum Research Branch, U.S. Office of Education	1964-65
Member,	Committee of Consultants, National Program of Educational Laboratories, U.S. Office of Education	1965-66
Member,	National Advisory Committee on Eudcational Laboratories, U.S. Office of Education	1966-69
Member,	Research Advisory Committee, American Council on Education	1966-73
Consultant,	International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement	1966-72
Member,	Board of Directors, National Society for the Study of Education	1969-75 1976-79
	Chairman	1971-72 1978-79

Member,	Executive Committee, Council for Educational Development and Research	1970-71
Visiting Fellow,	National Institute of Education (NIE)	1974
Chairman,	NIE Conference on Studies in Teaching	1974
Consultant,	International Institute for Educational Planning (Paris)	1973-74
Consultant, Lecturer,	College of Education, University of Maryland	1975-76
Consultant,	Multi-ethnic Study of Educational Desegregation, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development	1978-
Consultant,	Indonesian Project on Teacher Foundation (Jakarta)	1979
Consultant, Lecturer,	Australian Association for Research in Education (Melbourne)	1979
Member,	National Academy of Education	1979-
Consultant,	University of Florida, Department of Teacher Education	1979

The editor of A Handbook of Research on Teaching to which he contributed, Gage also edited The Psychology of Teaching Methods, a Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, and co-edited Readings in the Social Psychology of Education. In addition to being a co-author of Educational Psychology, Gage is the author of Teacher Effectiveness and Teacher Education and The Scientific Basis of the Art of Teaching and co-author of Educational Measurement and Evaluation and A Practical Introduction to Measurement and Evaluation.

Curriculum Vitae

TORSTEN HUSEN

Born in Lund (Sweden), 1916. B.A. 1937, M.A. 1938, and Ph.D. 1944 at the University of Lund.

Instructor and Research Assistant, University of Lund, Department of Psychology, 1938-44; Psychologist, Swedish Armed Forces, 1942-47; Associate Professor, Educational Psychology, University of Stockholm, 1947-52; Professor of Educational Psychology, University of Stockholm, 1953-56; Professor of Education, Graduate School of Education, and Director, Institute of Educational Research, 1956-71; University Chair in International Education, University of Stockholm, 1971 to present. Director, Institute of International Education, 1971 to present.

Visiting Professor at the University of Chicago, 1959; University of Hawaii, 1968; the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1971. Fellow, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, 1965-66 and 1973-74; National Humanities Center, North Carolina, 1978-79.

Honorary doctorates at the University of Chicago, the University of Rhode Island, the University of Glasgow, Brunel University, England and the University of Joensuu, Finland. The Teachers College, Columbia University Medal for Distinguished Service. Associate Member, U.S. National Academy of Education, 1967. Member, Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, 1972. Foreign member, Finnish Academy of Sciences, 1974. Foreign member, Polish Academy of Sciences, 1977. Member of Scientific Board of Max Planck Institute for Educational Research, Berlin, 1964.

Expert and Member of several Royal Commissions within the Swedish Ministry of Education, 1953-65. Member of the Prime Minister's Panel of Scientific Advisers, 1962-69. Chairman, International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), 1962-78, and President, 1978 to present. Chairman, Governing Board of the International Institute for Educational Planning, Paris, 1970 to 1980. Member, Board of Trustees and Executive Committee, International Council for Educational Development, 1970 to present. Consultant to the Organization for Economic Development and Co-operation, Paris, since 1968. Member of the OECD Committee on Education and Working Life, 1974. Chairman, National Commission on Education in Botswana, 1976-77. Member and Rapporteur of OECD Review of U.S. policies on the education of the disadvantaged, 1978-79.

The author of some 30 books, among them the following: Psychological Twin Studies (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1959); Problems of Differentiation in Swedish Compulsory Schooling (Stockholm: Scandinavian University Books, 1962); International Study of Achievement in Mathematics I-II (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1967); Talent, Opportunity and Career (Almqvist & Wiksell, 1969); Social Background and Educational Career (Paris: OECD, 1972); The Swedish School System in International Perspective, Vol. I: Science Education (Stockholm and

New York: Almqvist & Wiksell, and Wiley, 1973); The Learning Society (London: Methuen, 1974); Talent, Equality, and Meritocracy (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1974); Social Influences on Educational Attainments (Paris: OECD, 1975); The School in Question (London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1979); The Future of Formal Education (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1980).

On the Editorial Board or Board of Consulting Editors of: Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, Vita Humana, Sociology of Education, Comparative Education Review, Teachers College Record, Western European Education.

Member, International Advisory Board of the World Book Encyclopedia, and Editorial Advisory Board of the International Encyclopedia of Higher Education. Co-editor-in-Chief of International Encyclopedia of Education, 1980.

Curriculum Vitae

JAMES WILLIAM SINGLETON

Born in Manchester, England, 1919. B.A. (Honour English Language and Literature, 1949), University of Toronto. Graduate of Toronto Normal School as a elementary school teacher. Graduate of the Ontario College of Education (Toronto) as a secondary school teacher.

Taught in a one-room, rural school at Belle Ewart and graded schools in York Borough (1939-1950). Teacher in, and vice-Principal of a secondary school in York Borough (1950-1957). Principal of a high school in North York (1957-59). Director of Education for Burlington Board of Education (1959-69). Director of Education for the Region of Halton (1969-75). Retired.

Military Service - First Canadian Tank Brigade. Service in Sicily, Italy, Belgium and Holland (1940-45).

Professional Organizations - President of the Ontario Secondary School Teachers Federation (1958). Member of the Board of Governors of the Ontario Teachers Federation (1957-58). Vice-President of the Association of Directors of Education in Ontario (1968-69). Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Ontario Council for Leadership in Educational Administration. Member of the Board of Governors of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (1968 and 1969).

Member of the Minister's Committee on the Training of Secondary School Teachers (1962-64). Member of the Minister's Committee on the Training of Elementary School Teachers (1965-66). Dean of Summer School for Teachers at London, Ontario (1966 and 1967). Member of the Minister's Committee on Teacher Shortage (1968).

Received the Bartlett Award from the Ontario School Trustees' Council for outstanding contribution to education in Ontario. Made a Fellow of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (1975). Received the Leadership Award from the Ontario Association of Education Administrative Officials (1974).

A long-time student of educational organization and administration, and a frequent speaker and writer on the topics of The Role of the Trustee, The New Trustee, The Chief Executive Officer, The Role of the Principal and other aspects of school organization.